



CA2 0N  
DE 61  
- M35

ONTARIO, COMMITTEE  
ON  
UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

Minutes of Meetings

February 7, 1972 -  
June 26, 1972.

~~Approved  
Publications~~  
[6-2]







CAZONDE 61

-M35

Government  
Publications

~~ONTARIO, COMMITTEE~~  
~~ON~~  
~~UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS~~

~~Minutes of Meetings~~

~~February 7, 1972 -~~  
~~June 26, 1972.~~

~~Editorial  
Publications~~  
~~[G-2]~~







Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2024 with funding from  
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761120622733>







COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held  
on Monday, 7th February, 1972, in the Board  
Room of the Committee on University Affairs  
commencing at 10:00 a.m.

Minute

1889 PRESENT

Dr. J. G. Parr	Acting Chairman
Mr. P. Beatty	
Mr. W. Dodge	
The Honourable L. M. Frost, P.C., Q.C.	
Mr. J. O'N. Hughes	
Dr. M. J. Lavigne	
Mr. R. W. Mitchell, Q.C.	
Dr. R. J. Rossiter	
Mr. N. A. Sisco	

Mr. H. A. Cotnam  
Mr. J. C. Yen

Mr. H. H. Walker	Secretary
Mr. A. P. Gordon	
Mr. L. M. Johnston	
Mr. F. Kidd	
Mr. J. D. McCullough	
Mr. D. J. Ferguson	

1890 REVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS AFFECTING ESTIMATES 1972-73

Mr. Walker referred to the "Notes to Summary of Expenditure Following Committee on University Affairs Decisions" and noted that the recommendations found in the summary determined the level of expenditure for the estimates of 1972-73. He then stated that the Treasury Board had requested that the Committee give its advice in the event that it was necessary to reduce the estimates of 1972-73 by \$25 million.

The Committee agreed that it would review its recommendations relating to the expenditure levels for 1972-73 and would attempt to indicate an order of priority if in fact it was found that further reductions were required.

Considerable discussion ensued on the recommendations found within the "Notes to Summary of Expenditure Following Committee on University Affairs Decisions". Dr. Rossiter pointed out that the Committee had recommended that grade 12 programs at Brock University should receive support at normal operating levels and enquired whether this arrangement was reasonable since the programs at the "preliminary





year" level (Carleton, Windsor) received a formula weight of only .75. Mr. Gordon stated that the Brock program for grade 12 students differed from the "preliminary year" programs and that Brock students were enrolled in normal first-year university programs whereas students in "preliminary year" programs were not yet at this level.

With respect to Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, it was noted that the Department of Colleges and Universities had prepared a preliminary estimate of required operating support but that this level of support would have to be reviewed by the Committee at a later date.

Reference was made to the weighting of part-time students from one-sixth to one-fifth. It was agreed that while clarification of the criteria for integration of part-time with full-time students was essential, it would not be appropriate to remain at the one-sixth level in the interim, and the value of two-elevenths be confirmed for 1972-73.

The discussion then turned to the procedural aspects of reviewing and revising recommended expenditure levels. Mr. Dodge noted that it was his opinion that the recommendations of the Committee respecting expenditure levels for 1972-73 were quite satisfactory and reflected a fair assessment of the needs and requirements of the universities. In light of this factor, he enquired whether it was now appropriate to attempt to revise the recommendations.

Mr. Mitchell responded to Mr. Dodge's comments and stated that it was his opinion that it was reasonable for the Government to ask for advice of the Committee in the event that further reductions were required. He pointed out that should the Committee decline a reassessment, the Government would have little choice but to attempt this revision in a uni-lateral manner. Mr. Mitchell noted that this might not be a desirable development given the role of the Committee as an advisory body. Dr. Parr added that it was his recollection that at least once in the past the Treasury Board had indicated to the Committee where it would wish to make reductions but that the Committee had insisted that if reductions were in fact required, it was the responsibility of the Treasury Board to consult with the Committee regarding priorities as they were perceived by the Committee.

Dr. Rossiter noted that some reductions in expenditure could be effected by raising the general level of formula fees. He stated that the Committee had recommended a general fee increase in the summer of 1971 but that no action had been taken by the Government on this matter in the interim. He enquired whether it was now advisable





to re-affirm this recommendation for the school year 1972-73, since the lead time was obviously short.

Mr. Mitchell enquired about the possibility of revising the BIU value to a lower level. Considerable discussion ensued about the advisability of this alternative during which Dr. Rossiter noted that it would be extremely difficult to recommend further reductions in this area since the BIU value of \$1,765 for 1972-73 was already considered to be only marginal. Mr. Walker further pointed out that the 1972-73 BIU value had already been announced to the universities by the Minister in his letter of 26th April, 1971, and that it would be difficult to move back from this commitment.

The Committee agreed that it would not recommend a further reduction in the value of the basic income unit given the arguments noted in the above.

The discussion then turned to a consideration of the possibility of revising the loan limit for the OSAP program. It was noted that the Committee had recommended that the loan level be raised to \$800 for 1972-73 but that an increase to \$1,000 was not considered to be appropriate at this time. Mr. Gordon pointed out that in recommending that the loan level be raised to \$800, the Committee had already expressed its concern about the possible negative impact on students from lower socio-economic groups. It was further acknowledged that in raising the loan level from \$600 to \$800, the Committee had already effected a substantial saving to the Government. Mr. Beatty enquired whether it might not be possible to recommend the establishment of an enrolment quota for the Ontario university system. Considerable discussion ensued on this alternative during which it was agreed that no recommendations could be made in this direction without a major analysis of the parameters involved. It was noted that the views of the Commission on Post-Secondary Education would have to be sought and that an evaluation would have to be made respecting the "open door" policy of the Government.

The Committee agreed that it would now be desirable to prepare a draft proposal in the event that the Committee was asked to indicate its priorities for further reduction in the present level of support to universities and colleges. It was agreed that the draft proposal should be prepared according to the following guidelines:

1. That all recommendations respecting the present levels of expenditure within the colleges and universities reflected a thorough assessment by the Committee as to the real needs and requirements of the universities.





2. If further reductions were required, however, the Committee was of the opinion that the Government should consider:

- (a) the possibility of a general percentage increase in formula fees, bearing in mind that it might not be advisable to move in this direction in 1972-73 given the short lead time for adjustment. The Committee also wished to point out that this alternative had already been suggested by the Committee in the summer of 1971 but that no action had been taken in the interim,
- (b) an increase in the recommended loan level for the Ontario Student Award Program bearing in mind the possibility of a negative impact on students from the lower socio-economic groups. The Committee also wished to point out to the Government that the recommendations to increase the loan level from \$600 to \$800 had already effected substantial savings for fiscal 1972-73,
- (c) not decreasing the value of the basic income unit since the increase in 1972-73 BIU value over the 1971-72 value was already only marginal,
- (d) not limiting university enrolment in 1972-73. The Committee noted that this alternative was subject to further discussion at a later date.

Mr. Gordon added that in discussing the possibility of a general fee increase, the Committee might consider the advisability of attempting to rationalize fee increases on a selective basis. He stated that it might be desirable to effect a better correspondence between the real costs of programs and fees charged for these programs.

Mr. Walker noted that further alternatives for cost reduction (such as program re-weighting) would have to be considered at a later date and at the advice of the Commission on Post-Secondary Education.

#### LUNCHEON

The discussion continued on the preparation of a draft proposal for expenditure reductions. It was agreed that the Acting Chairman would prepare a final draft proposal





reflecting the opinion of the Committee and would submit this proposal to the Minister at the earliest date. (A copy of the final version of the draft proposal is attached.)

Mr. Sisco noted that in attempting to indicate priorities for reducing the 1972-73 estimates by a further \$25 million, the reduction should be pro-rated to reflect the relative levels of expenditure between the universities on the one hand and the colleges on the other.

1891 BILINGUALISM GRANTS

University of Ottawa

The Committee agreed that it would not recommend a reduction in the level of support to be given to the University of Ottawa in the amount of \$1,500,000. It was furthermore agreed that the Committee had likely understated the needs of universities offering bilingual programs although further analysis would be required to substantiate this opinion. The Committee also agreed that the University of Ottawa should receive a sum of \$300,000 towards the costs of bilingualism programs in the fiscal year 1971-72.

Laurentian University

It was agreed that Laurentian University qualified for a portion of the Federal allocation for bilingual programs. No further funds would be recommended for the University of Sudbury program from the Provincial Treasury.

1892 ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION - GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS 1972-73

It was agreed that the Committee should re-affirm its recommendation that students at OISE should qualify for Ontario Graduate Fellowship programs. However, the current regulations for OGF's specifically exclude students in education. It was agreed that a special allowance to OISE be recommended to reflect the commitment made to OISE. The Committee furthermore recommended that this arrangement should be made for 1972-73 only and that students wishing to benefit from this program should conform to the general OGF regulations. The amount of the special grant should be in proportion to the number of graduate students at OISE compared to the Provincial total.

1893 WEIGHTING OF STUDENTS IN NEW PROGRAMS OF ARTS AND SCIENCE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

It was agreed that this matter should be referred to the Joint COU/CUA Subcommittee on Operating Support for final recommendations. The Committee further recommended that the University of Toronto should receive no extra funding for its arts and science program in 1971-72.



- 1894 RYERSON POLYTECHNICAL INSTITUTE  
The Committee agreed to postpone discussion of this item to a later date.
- 1895 SERVICE FOR ADMISSION TO COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES  
Mr. Gordon referred to a letter from the Council of Ontario Universities requesting a re-assessment of the decision not to support the SACU program. The Committee recommended that the Minister should re-affirm his earlier decision regarding this matter.
- 1896 SPECIAL CASES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, BROCK UNIVERSITY, WATERLOO LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY AND THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO  
The Committee agreed to postpone the discussion of this item to another date.
- 1897 GRADUATE COURSES IN EDUCATION - SUMMER OF 1972 AND 1972-73  
The Committee agreed to recommend support for the programs at The University of Western Ontario and Queen's University in programs in education for one additional year. It was furthermore agreed that support levels for future years would be contingent upon ACAP discipline assessment.
- 1898 NIPISSING COLLEGE  
The Committee agreed to re-affirm its recommendation that Nipissing College be allowed to initiate programs in second and third year. The Committee also noted that these programs should be given in arts subjects only.
- 1899 FUTURE MEETING  
It was tentatively agreed that the Committee would hold its next meeting on 21st February, 1972 at 10:00 a.m.

The meeting concluded at 5:00 p.m.

.....  
Chairman

.....  
Secretary











COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on  
Monday, 21st February 1972, in the Board Room  
of the Committee on University Affairs commencing  
at 10:15 a.m.

Minute  
1900

PRESENT

Dr. J. G. Parr  
Mr. W. Dodge  
The Honourable L. M. Frost, P.C., Q.C.  
Dr. R. Gerstein  
Mr. J. O'N. Hughes  
Dr. M. J. Lavigne  
Mr. R. W. Mitchell, Q.C.  
Dr. R. J. Rossiter

Acting Chairman

Mr. N. A. Sisco

Mr. H. A. Cotnam  
Mr. J. C. Yen

Mr. H. H. Walker  
Mr. A. P. Gordon  
Mr. L. M. Johnston  
Mr. F. Kidd  
Mr. J. D. McCullough  
Mr. D. J. Ferguson  
Mr. S. Nousiainen

Secretary

1901 APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 7th FEBRUARY, 1972

The Committee approved the Minutes of the meeting of 7th February, 1972. Mr. Kidd noted that the Committee should re-affirm that support to emerging universities in 1972-73 should be based on the same principle as had been recommended for 1971-72. The Committee agreed to this recommendation.

Mr. Dodge noted that some members of the Committee had received requests to meet with Mr. G. R. Maddocks to discuss the work of the Committee and enquired whether it would be appropriate for the members of the Committee to respond to Mr. Maddocks' request. The Committee agreed that each member should respond to this request in whatever manner he (she) felt appropriate.



1902 BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

- (a) Criteria for Integration of Part-time with Full-time Studies  
A revised set of "Criteria for the Operation of Integrated Part-time Study Programs in Ontario Universities" was distributed to the Committee members. The Committee approved this set of "Criteria" and agreed that copies be distributed to the universities for comment.
- (b) Review of Recommendations for Reductions in Projected Expenditures  
The Committee agreed that the draft statement respecting reductions in projected expenditures adequately reflected the priorities of the Committee as they had been set out at the Committee meeting of 7th February 1972.
- (c) Special Cases at the University of Toronto, Brock University and Waterloo Lutheran University

University of Toronto

With respect to the request from Dr. C. Hanly under the letterhead of the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations for assistance to transitional year students at the University of Toronto, it was noted that in the event the Committee wished to recommend further support for this program, this should be done on the basis of one year only and at formula weight of .7. Dr. Gerstein noted that the transitional year program was innovative in nature and could substantially benefit disadvantaged students.

The Committee agreed that before final recommendations could be made it would be appropriate to ask the University of Toronto to give the Committee a formal institutional statement.

Waterloo Lutheran University

Dr. Parr noted that the Committee had previously recommended that formula support be given to a specified number of students entering Brock University from the Ontario grade 12 system. Since the Waterloo Lutheran University operated a similar program, he enquired whether it might now be appropriate to extend formula support to this University on the same basis. Mr. Gordon noted that there was considerable justification for recommending support of this kind to Waterloo Lutheran since this University already qualified for operating support at a 50 per cent level.

Mr. Dodge stated that it was his opinion that Waterloo Lutheran University should not necessarily qualify for support on the same basis as had been extended to Brock University. He noted that the Committee had been fairly explicit that the Brock program was of an experimental nature, and that there would not necessarily be a case for extending support to other universities operating similar programs. He enquired whether it was altogether appropriate to consider formula support for denominational institutions within the guidelines generally used for non-church-affiliated institutions.





Dr. Gerstein further noted that the situation with respect to funding students from the Ontario grade 12 system would probably become more complex in the near future. She stated that since the secondary schools were now increasingly moving away from classifying students on a chronological basis, grade distinctions in future will be even more difficult to make.

In view of the difficulties noted above, Dr. Parr suggested that the Committee should attempt to study the situation more closely taking into account the anomalies found within the present system. Specifically, he noted that the Committee would have to reconcile the question of support to denominational institutions, and would have to consider the rationale for extending support to "mature" students and students entering the Ontario system from grade 12 in other provinces.

The Committee agreed that in the interim it would recommend support to the Brock University grade 12 program but would not recommend support to Waterloo Lutheran University until such time that a further study had been made.

## 1903 NEW BUSINESS

### (a) Enrolment Forecasts 1972-73

Dr. Parr initiated a discussion on enrolment forecasts for 1972-73. He stated that the possibility existed that enrolments in 1972-73 might not reach projected levels and enquired whether the Committee might wish to approach this problem at this time. He then asked Mr. Ferguson to outline the enrolment situation as it was currently known to the Department of Colleges and Universities.

A "Report to the Committee on University Affairs re 1972-73 University Enrolment" was distributed to the Committee members. Mr. Ferguson referred to this report and noted that it was not possible to make a firm statement about enrolment levels for 1972-73 at this time. He did state, however, that more information would be forthcoming from the Ontario Universities Application Centre in the near future and it might be possible to undertake a better analysis at that time.

A general discussion ensued on the problem of making accurate enrolment projections. Mr. Gordon noted that the universities should be encouraged to prepare their projections at realistic levels since there is a tendency to hire faculty on the basis of enrolment and, in the event that these projections do not materialize, the universities would find themselves in financial difficulties.

The Committee agreed that for the present time it would be appropriate to stay with present enrolment forecasts, but that the system should be monitored for early indications of enrolment problems.



(b) Programs in Social Work

Dr. Parr stated that a number of Schools of Social Work within the province appeared to be experiencing financial difficulties due to the high cost of field work and the recent withdrawal of federal agencies from existing funding arrangements. He enquired whether the Committee would agree to recommend that a joint subcommittee of COU and CUA be struck to consider this problem. The Committee recommended that this course of action be undertaken and that one member of the proposed subcommittee be invited (by Mr. Walker) from the Department of Social and Family Services.

(c) Procedures Respecting Secretariat Services for Joint COU/CUA Subcommittees

Dr. Parr referred to a letter from the Council of Ontario Universities dated 28th January, 1972 regarding a statement of procedures in respect of joint sub-committees. Mr. Gordon noted that although the COU had requested that the Secretariat Services be now shared between the two organizations, it was his opinion that the services should remain with the Department of Colleges and Universities for the time being. The Committee concurred. Mr. Gordon added that it would be useful to consider the final recommendations of the Commission on Post-Secondary Education before structural changes are made.

(d) Graduate Students

McMaster University

Mr. Kidd referred to the recent strike by McMaster University graduate students in response to the Federal Government's regulations regarding unemployment insurance and hospital expenses. He stated that the Committee might consider recommending an increase in the level of permitted earnings as one solution to the problem.

Mr. Gordon responded by noting that a ceiling had originally been placed on permitted earnings since there was an indication that funds were being funnelled away from undergraduate instruction and given to graduate instruction. He further suggested that the situation would not improve if the ceiling were raised.

The Committee decided that it would be appropriate to direct this problem to the Joint COU/CUA Subcommittee on Goals and Policies for Graduate Development for further direction. Mr. Dodge noted that since the problem was largely caused by Federal initiatives, there might be some justification for approaching the Federal Government with respect to this problem.

(e) Ph.D. Philosophy Guelph - Joint Program with McMaster University

The Committee noted that at its 24th January, 1972 meeting, it had decided to recommend that the embargo should stand on the Ph.D. program in Guelph. Dr. Parr suggested that since the Ph.D. program in Guelph was a joint program with McMaster, the Committee might wish to reconsider its recommendation. It was agreed that the Committee would now recommend that the embargo be removed from the Ph.D. program at Guelph and that recognition be given to the innovative nature of this program.





1904 OTHER MATTERS

(a) Operating Formula Review

Dr. Parr noted that the Joint COU/CUA Subcommittee on Finance-Operating Support, was currently in the process of preparing a draft version of a report on operating formula review. He enquired whether it might be appropriate to instruct the Joint Subcommittee to defer this work in view of the work currently being conducted by the Commission on Post-Secondary Education. The Committee agreed to recommend that work on the operating formula review should be postponed.

LUNCHEON

(b) Conversion Engineering Program - Lakehead University

Dr. Parr noted that the Joint COU/CUA Subcommittee on Operating Support had recommended against the proposal to raise the formula weight as suggested in the Lakehead brief. He enquired whether it would be appropriate to refer this matter back to the Joint Subcommittee since it was his opinion that not all pertinent facts were reported to the Subcommittee. The Committee recommended this procedure.

(c) Emerging Grants

Considerable discussion ensued on the basis to be used for calculating emerging grants in future years. Mr. Gordon noted that a strong argument could be mounted to suggest that emerging universities should, within a reasonable period of time, begin to live within the limits set by normal operating support. It was generally agreed that it would be possible to recommend that the computation for 1972-73 should be conducted on the same basis as the computation for 1971-72, but that the universities would henceforth be advised that the calculation of emerging grants might in future be based on a time scale.

It was agreed that the emerging grants be tentatively calculated on the same basis as had grants in 1971-72 but that the Chairman would write to the universities seeking more information and their advice regarding alternate methods of funding. It was also agreed that future calculations might usefully make distinctions between emerging universities and institutions whose location incurred demonstrably higher costs.

(d) Ph.D. Physical Education - The University of Western Ontario

The Committee noted that a recommendation had been made to remove the embargo on the above program at the CUA meeting of 24th January, 1972. Mr. Nousiainen pointed out that since Ph.D. programs on physical education had been designated as being in need of planning assessment, the Committee might now agree to let the embargo stand. It was agreed that the embargo should stand on this program until such time as a planning assessment had been completed.



- (e) Graduate Diploma Faunal Resource Management - University of Guelph  
The Committee agreed to recommend approval for this program subject to appraisal.

1905 BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

- (a) Review of Other Matters Arising from Briefs "Analysis and Statistical Summary Respecting Ontario Universities" - Part B - pages 92-99  
A summary statement entitled, "Other Matters Arising from University Briefs as listed on pages 92-99 of the "blue book" summary - December 1971" was distributed to the Committee members. Mr. McCullough noted that all matters respecting capital items found within these pages were of an administrative nature and did not require policy direction. He then proceeded to outline details concerning requests for capital funding.

The Committee reviewed requests from individual institutions in the following manner:

Brock University

With respect to the extra-formula grant for the Faculty of Education, Mr. Gordon noted that the Department of Colleges and Universities was presently preparing background material to be included on the agenda for the next Committee meeting.

Lakehead University

It was noted that Lakehead University had requested an increase in formula weight from 1.0 to 1.2 for students enrolled in technology diploma courses. The Committee agreed that some form of averaging process might result in a more adequate formula weight. It was agreed that this matter would be looked at in conjunction with the earlier noted items regarding formula weights for 3rd and 4th year students.

The Committee noted that Lakehead University had requested special support for credit courses offered in outlying communities in northwestern Ontario. It was agreed that the Department of Colleges and Universities would prepare a short summary paper on this item which would be discussed at the next Committee meeting.

Queen's University

The Committee noted that a number of requests had been received from part-time and inter-sessional students to qualify for student aid under the Student Awards program. Mr. Gordon noted that this problem was presently under study but that no results had yet been received.





1906 FUTURE MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

Dr. Parr noted that the Committee might consider a new structure for Committee meetings during the 1972-73 cycle. He stated that it might now be more useful to begin to grapple with more fundamental problems facing the universities and that the present arrangements might not be the most appropriate method for doing this. Mr. Dodge added that it was his opinion that it would be most useful for the Committee to hold a meeting where broader issues could be discussed by the Committee members. He noted that working meetings of the Committee do not presently allow for adequate consideration of deeper issues such as the problem of sabbatical leaves, teaching vs. research, and so on.

The Committee agreed that it would be useful to call a meeting of this nature during the summer period.

It was agreed that the Committee would meet on Monday, 13th March, 1972.

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

.....  
Chairman

.....  
Secretary









COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held  
on Monday, 13th. March, 1972, in the Board  
Room of the Committee on University Affairs  
commencing at 10:00 a.m.

Minute

1907     PRESENT

Dr. J. G. Parr	Chairman
Mr. P. Beatty	
Mr. W. Dodge	
The Honourable L.M. Frost, P.C., Q.C.	
Dr. R. Gerstein	
Mr. J. O.'N. Hughes	
Mr. R. W. Mitchell	
Dr. R. J. Rossiter	
Mr. N. A. Sisco	

Mr. J. C. Yen

Mr. H. H. Walker	Secretary
Mr. A. P. Gordon	
Mr. F. Kidd	
Mr. D. J. Ferguson	
Mr. S. Nousiainen	

1908     APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 21st. FEBRUARY, 1972

The Committee approved the minutes of the 21st. February,  
1972 meeting.

1909     LETTER FROM Dr. D. T. WRIGHT

Dr. Parr read a letter from Dr. D. T. Wright thanking the  
Committee members for their hospitality at a recent social  
function.

1910     LAKEHEAD UNIVERSITY ENGINEERING CONVERSION DEGREE PROGRAM

Dr. Parr informed the members of the Committee that he had  
recently met with representatives of Lakehead University  
to discuss funding arrangements for the Conversion Degree  
Program in Engineering. He noted that the proposal to  
fund summer course work was not satisfactory to the Lakehead  
representatives (normal funding for summer courses is, in  
any case, anticipated) and that a new proposal would be  
prepared. He furthermore noted that Lakehead University had  
agreed to forward additional documentation to the Committee,  
upon receipt of which the matter would be referred to the Joint



COU/CUA Subcommittee on Finance - Operating Support, for further recommendations.

1911 B.I.U. WEIGHTINGS FOR ARTS & SCIENCE PROGRAMS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AND THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO.

Dr. Parr informed the Committee members that the Joint COU/CUA subcommittee on Finance Operating Support, was currently in the process of preparing recommendations with respect to B.I.U. Weightings at these institutions. Upon completion of this work, the Committee will be informed of the recommendations.

1912 SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK SUBCOMMITTEE

Dr. Parr informed the Committee members that action had been taken to form a subcommittee to consider the problems of provincial schools of social work.

1913 UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PROGRAM FOR TRANSITIONAL YEAR STUDENTS

Dr. Parr noted that the Committee had requested that the University of Toronto be asked to give a formal institutional statement with respect to the proposed transitional year program at the University of Toronto. He stated that a letter had now been received from the University of Toronto giving support to this program. The Committee agreed that it would now recommend financial support for this program, for one year only, at a formula weight of .7.

1914 PROPOSAL: SUPPORT FOR OFF-CAMPUS EXTENSION PROGRAMS IN NORTHERN ONTARIO LAKEHEAD UNIVERSITY

A proposal entitled "Support for Off-Campus Extension Programs in Northern Ontario, Lakehead University" was distributed to the Committee members. Considerable discussion ensued on this proposal during which Mr. Frost noted that it was his opinion that the Committee should be extremely careful about recommending support of this nature. He particularly noted that there was cause for concern with respect to the kind of precedent this proposal might set to other universities in the province. He also enquired whether it would be possible to limit extra-formula support to institutions in Northern Ontario.

Mr. Gordon pointed out that the Committee had on previous occasions expressed concern about limited accessibility of educational services to students in outlying communities in Northern Ontario, and for that reason, had recommended that extra-formula consideration should be granted to those institutions serving this area. The Committee agreed that the proposal, in principle, was a sound one, and it was therefore recommended that the Committee should advise the Minister that support for off-campus extension programs should be granted to institutions in Northern Ontario. It was decided that the wording of the proposal would have to be amended so that it was clear that the support would be available to institutions only in Northern Ontario. It was also agreed that off-campus courses qualifying for additional financial support could only be offered beyond a minimum of 75 road miles from the nearest post-secondary educational institution (including the sponsoring institution). Dr. Parr indicated that the proposal would be redrafted so that it would conform to these amendments and that a recommendation would be made to the Minister at the earliest opportunity.





1915 GRANTS FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION 1973-74

Mr. Nousiainen enquired whether it would be appropriate for the Committee to recommend support levels for bilingual education for the year 1973-74. He noted that, in past years, it had been the practice of the Committee to recommend support levels for two years. Mr. Walker stated that the question of bilingual grants for years beyond 1972-73 would require further study. It was agreed to defer this item until the next meeting of the Committee.

1916 PROCEDURES FOR APPROVAL OF PROPOSED GRADUATE PROGRAMS

A memorandum entitled " Summary of Events Leading to Inconsistencies in New Program Recommendations" was distributed to the Committee members. Considerable discussion ensued on the contents of the memorandum. It was generally noted that internal procedures relating to Committee work and recommendations required a re-assessment so that the Committee could move in a more efficient manner. Dr. Rossiter specifically noted that since the Committee had been inconsistent in its program recommendations, it should now do all that was possible to speed up the process of program approval. He further noted that the Advisory Committee on Academic Planning should be informed at the earliest opportunity of the Committee's interest in resolving the problem which arose from recommendations with respect to graduate programs in Physical Education, Criminology, and Journalism. Dr. Parr responded by stating that the Joint COU/CUA subcommittee on Graduate Goals and Policies would be meeting on Tuesday, March 14th, 1972 and that he would ask that this committee recommend to ACAP that planning assessments in the programs noted in the above should be given first priority.

1917 REVIEW OF PAST RECOMMENDATIONS WITH RESPECT TO IMPLEMENTATION OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Mr. Nousiainen stated that new information had been received with respect to the problem of modifying the embargo on graduate programs and that the Committee would have to review certain of its recommendations with respect to these programs. The Committee agreed to the following revisions:

GUELPH UNIVERSITY - It was agreed that the Ph.D. in Agricultural Economics, which had formerly been approved for implementation, should now be under embargo. It was noted that the primary focus of this program appeared to be on Economics, and since Economics appeared on the embargo list, the decision would have to be reversed.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA - The Committee agreed that the Ph.D. program in Criminology should not receive approval at this time. It was noted that Criminology was on the embargo list, and that the advice of ACAP would be sought.

The Committee furthermore agreed that the M.A. in Comparative Education should now definitely be placed on embargo. The M.A. program in Comparative Literature and Computer Science would be given to ACAP for further review.



UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO - It was agreed that the M.A. in Journalism should be referred to ACAP for further advice. The Committee noted that two proposals had been received for M.A. programs in Journalism and it might not be appropriate to approve both. The Ph.D. in Physical Education was referred to ACAP for early planning assessment together with the Ph.D. in Criminology from the University of Ottawa. Journalism programs were also referred for early assessment. The Committee furthermore agreed that the M.Ed. in Administration, the M.Ed. Guidance and the M.A.(T.) History, Physical Education, Mathematics, and Applied Mathematics should be on embargo. The M.A. program in Anthropology would be referred to ACAP for further advice.

CARLETON UNIVERSITY - The Committee agreed that it would refer the M.A. program in Journalism to ACAP for further advice.

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY - The Committee agreed to refer the M.A. program in Sociology to ACAP for further advice.

UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO - The Committee agreed that it would give further attention to the M.Sc. Program in Kinesiology. It was agreed that the M.A. program in Recreation should be on embargo since it was a program in Physical Education.

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR - The Committee agreed that the Ph.D. program in History and Theology should be on embargo.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY - The Committee agreed that the proposed Ph.D. program in Anthropology and the M.A. program in Social Work would be referred to ACAP for further advice.

APPEAL FROM YORK UNIVERSITY FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN GEOGRAPHY AND SOCIAL AND POLITICAL THOUGHT

Dr. Parr informed the Committee members that appeals had been received from York University for implementation of graduate programs in Geography and Social and Political Thought. He noted that appeal procedures had, at this point, not been finalized and that he would ask the COU/CUA joint subcommittee on Goals and Policies for Graduate Development to resolve this problem. It was agreed that the appeals from York University would be submitted to this subcommittee at its next meeting on Tuesday, March 14, 1972. It was furthermore agreed that appeals procedures would be discussed within this subcommittee and that a report would be given to the Committee on University Affairs at an early date. Dr. Rossiter emphasized that it was imperative that utmost haste be given to these problems so that the universities could be informed of the recommendations of the Committee.

Dr. Parr agreed that he would report back to the Committee following the meeting of the joint subcommittee on Goals and Policies for Graduate Development.

LUNCHEON





1918 EMERGING GRANTS 1972-73, 1973-74

Mr. Kidd distributed a summary calculation of emerging grants for 1972-73 outlining the financial implications of calculating these grants according to two alternative methods. He stated that if the Committee were to adopt the revised basis of calculating emerging grants, the universities would receive the following amounts

Brock	\$556,000	
Lakehead	951,000	
Laurentian	938,000	
Scarboro'	nil	
Erindale	278,000	
Trent	1,410,000	
		\$1,143,000

It was noted that, in effect, during an earlier meeting the Committee had agreed that emerging grants should in 1972-73 be calculated on the same basis as in 1971-72, and the figures noted in the above are those which would be produced.

Considerable discussion ensued on emerging grants, during which it was noted that the calculation of emerging grants on the basis of enrolments tended to produce a disincentive for reaching emergence. Dr. Parr enquired as to how appropriate it would be to continue calculating emerging grants on this basis given this problem. Mr. Sisco further noted that since the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology were now beginning to draw ever greater numbers of students, this would cause additional problems to the smaller institutions.

Dr. Rossiter indicated that the Committee might wish to adopt a system of emerging grants based on fixed amounts as opposed to enrolments. The Committee agreed that it would be appropriate to adopt fixed grants for 1972-73 but to advise the universities that emerging grants in future would be calculated on a different basis. The Committee furthermore recommended that the emerging universities should receive the amounts shown and itemized in the foregoing reduced by 10% and rounded off to the nearest \$5,000. For Trent University, the emerging grant would be fixed at \$1,400,000

1919 PROCEDURES FOR APPROVAL OF UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

Mr. Gordon initiated a discussion on approval of new programs and outlined the sequence of events leading to the department of Colleges and Universities request that undergraduate programs be also submitted for approval. Dr. Parr noted that it would now be appropriate to prepare a set of procedures for approval of undergraduate programs and to inform the universities of these procedures. It was tentatively agreed that the Department of Colleges and Universities would be instructed to prepare a general request to the universities detailing proposals for new undergraduate programs. It was furthermore agreed that, upon receipt of the detailed applications, the Committee would recommend any action which it felt appropriate.



1920 RYERSON POLYTECHNICAL INSTITUTE, BACHELOR OF RYERSON

A copy of a letter from Mr. D. L. Mordell was distributed to the Committee members. It was noted that Ryerson Polytechnical Institute had requested an opinion on a possible name change for its present Bachelor's Degree. The Committee agreed that it would recommend to the Minister that since the problem of changing the name of the Bachelor Degree was at this point an internal problem at Ryerson Polytechnical Institute and also required a change in legislation, the Committee could not properly give its advice. It was furthermore agreed that in the event that Ryerson Polytechnical Institute resolved the internal problem with respect to a name change, the Committee would be prepared to give its opinion to the Minister.

1921 REPORT- ESTIMATES 1972-73

Mr. Walker informed the Committee that the Minister had considered the Committee's recommendations with respect to support levels for 1972-73 and that the support levels had been reviewed by the Management Board. He noted that the Management Board had indicated that it would not be prepared to accept the increase to the B.I.U. value in the amount of \$5 to counteract legislation on Unemployment Insurance. Mr. Walker furthermore noted that the Management Board was receptive to establishing a loan limit at \$800 but also felt that a \$100 fee increase would be appropriate.

With respect to the Ontario Graduate Fellowship Program, the Management Board had indicated that it would appropriate a sum of \$3.0 million instead of \$3.5 million. In order to avoid the loan limit being increased to \$1,000, the Department planned a series of reductions in estimates. The most significant of those included the elimination of the grant of \$400,000 to the Ontario College of Art for purposes of rental and renovation of additional space would not be given. The Deputy Minister pointed out that since the Ontario College of Art is currently in the process of preparing a major analysis with regard to the aims and objectives and capital needs of the College it would not be appropriate to approve the funding of the \$400,000.

With respect to the Centre for Instructional Development, it was likely that complete implementation would not be possible in 1972-73 and funding level for this program would therefore be reduced in 1972-73. Dr. Parr noted that following the Management Board decision to reduce the O.G.F. allocation by \$500,000 he had indicated to the Minister his concern that the CUA had not been asked for its advice. Dr. Parr noted that the action of the Management Board did not conform to accepted procedures with respect to revision of support levels.





1922 PROPOSED LETTER -INTERNAL PROCEDURES OF CUA

Dr. Parr noted that it would be desirable to postpone action on the proposed letter describing procedures within the CUA. It was agreed that the Committee might return to this matter at a later date.

1923 C.O.P.S.E. REPORT - RESPONSE OF C.U.A.

Dr. Parr stated that the Committee might wish to consider responding formally to the report of the Committee on Post-Secondary Education. It was agreed that the Committee would prepare a formal response to the C.O.P.S.E. report at the earliest opportunity. In the interim, it was agreed that two subcommittees would be struck to consider this problem and to report back to the C.U.A. It was also agreed that the Minister would be informed that the C.U.A. wishes to respond formally to the C.O.P.S.E. Report.

1924 RESPONSE OF C.U.A. TO THE STUDY OF YEAR-ROUND OPERATION OF UNIVERSITIES

It was agreed to postpone discussion of this item until the next meeting.

1925 LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA -REPORT ON BAR ADMISSION COURSE

Mr. Dodge enquired whether the Committee had formally requested that the report on the future of the Bar Admission Course be forwarded to the Committee. Dr. Parr stated that he had recently written to the Law Society of Upper Canada and had been informed that this Report would be available to the Committee in the summer. It was furthermore noted that the C.O.P.S.E. background study on Legal Education would be relevant to any review concerning the Bar Admission Course.

1926 FUTURE MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

It was agreed that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on Monday, 24th April, 1972. It was further agreed that the meeting following this would be held on Monday, June 5th and Tuesday, June 6th at the Royal Botanical Gardens. Dr. Parr agreed to arrange for details of this meeting.









COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held  
on Monday, 24th April, 1972, in the Board Room  
of the Committee on University Affairs  
commencing at 10.00 a.m.

Minute  
1927

PRESENT

Dr. J. G. Parr	Chairman
The Honourable L. M. Frost, P.C., Q.C.	
Mr. J. O'N. Hughes	
Dr. M. Lavigne	
Mr. R. A. Mitchell	
Dr. R. J. Rossiter	
Mr. N. A. Sisco	

Mr. J. C. Yen

Mr. H. H. Walker	Secretary
Mr. A. P. Gordon	
Mr. L. M. Johnston	
Mr. F. Kidd	
Mr. D. McCullough	
Mr. D. Ferguson	
Mr. S. Nousiainen	

1928

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 13th MARCH, 1972

The Committee approved the minutes of the meeting of 13th March subject to a change in the last paragraph on page 1. The sentence "He noted that the proposal to fund summer course work was not satisfactory to the Lakehead representatives and that a new proposal would be prepared", was changed to "He noted that the proposal to fund summer course work was not satisfactory to the Lakehead representatives (normal funding for summer courses is, in any case, anticipated) and that a new proposal would be prepared".

1929

CEILING ON TEACHING ASSISTANTSHIPS

Dr. Parr stated that at the April 4th meeting of the joint CUA/COU sub-committee on Goals and Policies for Graduate Development it was agreed that the ceiling to be paid to teaching assistants should be increased to \$2,400 from \$1,800 effective September 1st, 1972. It had furthermore been agreed that an explicit statement would be made to indicate that these increases were to compensate for an escalation in costs of living as a result of graduate



students having to pay for medical services, unemployment insurance and fees of all kinds. It was noted that the increase in the level of teaching assistantships would not be justified on the basis of income tax legislation.

The Committee agreed that this recommendation be made to the Minister immediately. Dr. Parr added that the Council of Ontario Universities had already agreed to support this recommendation.

1930

COU RESPONSE TO "CRITERIA FOR INTEGRATION OF PART-TIME WITH FULL-TIME STUDIES"

Dr. Parr stated that a response had now been received from the COU with regard to the statement on "criteria for the operation of integrated part-time study programs in Ontario universities". He referred to a letter dated April 11th 1972 from Dr. J. B. Macdonald and noted that the COU had requested that some minor amendments should be made to the statement. Some discussion ensued on the proposed changes, following which it was agreed that the criteria for integration of part-time and full-time studies would be revised to reflect the COU request. It was also agreed that once the appropriate changes had been made, the Committee would recommend to the Minister that the criteria be accepted as a basis for calculating grants.

1931

FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS FOR LAKEHEAD UNIVERSITY ENGINEERING DEGREE CONVERSION PROGRAM

Dr. Parr referred to a memorandum which had been sent to the members of the Committee dealing with a proposed funding arrangement for the Lakehead University engineering conversion degree program. He stated that this proposal would likely not produce costs in excess of the original recommendation which the Committee had made for funding the engineering conversion program. (The original recommendation was to give a weighting of 2.5 B.I.Us for the third and fourth year of the degree program).

Mr. Walker enquired whether it was entirely appropriate to make these recommendations at this time since there was some chance that Lakehead University would at some recent future date be asked to discontinue offering diploma courses. It was generally agreed that while this possibility did indeed exist, it would not be appropriate to jeopardize the Lakehead program because of something which might eventuate in the longterm. It was therefore agreed that the proposal was satisfactory, and that a recommendation would be made to the Minister at once.





1932

REVISED GUIDELINES FOR DEALING WITH EMBARGO AND  
GRADUATE PROGRAMS AND APPEALS PROCEDURES

Dr. Parr referred to the "Statement Concerning Discipline Embargos and Procedures for Initiation of New Graduate Programs" which had been submitted to the Committee members under A.C.A.P. letterhead, signed by M. A. Preston. Some discussion ensued on the appropriateness of this statement during which it was noted that redrafting and editing were necessary. It was, for example, agreed that a clear statement would have to be made that the Minister was ultimately responsible for new program approvals. Mr. Walker added that it would also be desirable to revise the document so that consideration would be given to any and all discipline areas offered by the universities. It was his opinion that the statement, as it existed, was not sufficiently explicit about professional programs.

The Committee agreed that while, in principle, the statement reflected a consensus of opinion within the Committee, it would be desirable to redraft some portions. It was agreed that Dr. Parr and Mr. Nousiainen would undertake this work and present a complete and final statement to the Committee at the next meeting.

1933

MEETING WITH EXECUTIVE OF THE COUNCIL OF ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES

Dr. Parr stated that the Executive of the Council of Ontario Universities had requested that the Committee meet with them to discuss various implications of the recent governmental decision to implement a third term graduate student fee. He stated that the Executive of the COU had now arrived and that the Committee would meet with them. At this point in the proceedings the following members of COU were asked to join the Committee.

Dr. J. F. Leddy  
Dr. D. C. Williams  
Dr. J. B. Macdonald  
Dr. W. G. Tamblyn  
Dr. H. G. Thode  
Dr. T. H. Williamson  
Mr. Grant Clark

Dr. Williams stated that the COU had requested a meeting with the Committee on University Affairs to discuss the matter of third-term fees for graduate students which had been announced by the Government. He then asked Dr. Macdonald to outline the concern of the COU. Dr. Macdonald responded by noting that the specific concern of the COU related to those matters discussed in a letter to the Acting Chairman of the Committee



on University Affairs dated April 20, 1972. Each member of the Committee had been given a copy of this letter. Dr. Macdonald stated that it was the intention of COU to discuss principally the third-term fee and the incompatibility of this fee increase with the present student award program. The problem, in his opinion, was that the saving which had been effected by the introduction of the third-term fee could have been achieved through alternate methods and that these methods should now be explored.

Dr. Parr responded by noting that since the introduction of the third-term fee had been taken at the initiative of the Department of Colleges and Universities, it might be appropriate for Departmental representatives to respond to the COU delegates.

Mr. Walker stated that the imposition of the third-term fee was necessary since the Government was in a serious deficit position. For this reason, he noted, the Minister's letters to the Universities had stated that it was not possible to meet all recommendations of the CUA with respect to support levels. The imposition of a third-term fee was an example of attempting to deal with the problem. He also noted that Management Board had given the Minister only 48 hours in which to find reductions, and for this reason there was no time to consult with representatives of CUA or COU. Mr. Walker also noted that the impact of the third-term fee would not be immediate, the main saving being projected to take place in the summer of 1973-74.

Considerable discussion ensued on the merits of the fee increase, during which it was noted that there were reports that some students were contemplating moving to other Provinces to complete their graduate work. In addition, it was noted that students were presently in the process of making decisions about enrolling for the academic year 72-73 and that if changes were made with respect to the third-term fee, they would have to be made quickly.

Dr. Williams enquired whether it was in fact possible that the question of the third-term fee could be reopened at this point and, if so, would it be appropriate to let the joint CUA/COU sub-committee on finance evaluate alternatives?

Mr. Walker replied that the Minister was, of course, receptive to any suggestions, but caution would have to be exercised since this question had broader ramifications. As an example, he noted that Teachers College students might also ask for a re-evaluation.

Dr. Parr stated that the issue under discussion involved two separate problems; the first being the general justification





for a third-term fee; the second being the question that if there were justification, how best to phase it in?

It was agreed that the joint subcommittee on finance would be asked to meet at 4 p.m. in the Board Room of the CUA on April 24th to consider these issues. It was furthermore agreed that any recommendations the subcommittee might make with respect to the third-term fee would then be communicated to the respective members of the COU and CUA by telephone for ratification, prior to submission to the Minister.

The COU delegation withdrew from the meeting at this point.

1934 PROPOSED FORMAT FOR 1972-73 BRIEFS TO THE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

Mr. Ferguson outlined the basis of the proposed format for the 1972-73 Briefs to the Committee on University Affairs. He noted that he had discussed this matter with Dr. Parr at a prior date and that further work would be done on the format before it would be submitted to the joint CUA/COU meeting on May 5, 1972.

He stated that the Ministry of Colleges and Universities was planning to publish the data within the Briefs on November 1, 1972.

Mr. Nousiainen enquired whether it would be appropriate to disaggregate data on the basis of a male/female split. He noted that Dr. Gerstein had requested that some attention be given to this problem especially in the context of graduate enrolments.

It was generally agreed that this question would be addressed again at the May meeting of the CUA and that Dr. Gerstein would be asked to speak to this.

The Committee agreed to approve the proposed format on an interim basis.

1935 PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR 1972-73 CYCLE OF CUA MEETINGS

Dr. Parr referred to the proposed schedule for the 1972-73 cycle of CUA meetings and enquired whether it would be appropriate to finalize this draft. He specifically noted that it was his intention that the Committee should not visit individual campuses in the coming year but would devote much more time to the work of the subcommittees.

Mr. Walker enquired whether the proposed schedule allowed adequate time for meeting with the many institutions. Dr. Parr



replied that he felt that adequate time would be given to all institutions, but in the event that this proved not to be the case, an additional day could certainly be added to the schedule.

It was generally agreed that the work of the subcommittee would require considerable attention in the coming year and Mr. Nousiainen was asked to give consideration to the scope of subcommittee work which was expected. It was also agreed that the schedule with minor revisions would be placed before the joint CUA/COU meeting on May 5 for comment.

1936

#### POLICY GUIDELINES FOR GRADUATE STUDENT SUPPORT

Dr. Rossiter outlined the main recommendations of the draft policy guidelines for graduate student support prepared by the joint CUA/COU subcommittee on goals and policies for graduate development. He noted that it was the intention to implement this program in 1973-74 and that the award would be called the Ontario Graduate Scholarship.

He furthermore noted that the program would be administered by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies and that the Council of Ontario Universities had already approved these guidelines. Lastly, he stated that this program would increase the level of support for graduate students from the existing 3.0 million dollars (O.G.F. allocation) to 4.5 million dollars.

Mr. Gordon noted that the main emphasis of the new policy guidelines for graduate student support was to reward academic excellence as opposed to providing support to students on a basis of need. He enquired whether the Committee was fully certain that this priority was appropriate. He also noted that before final recommendations could be made with respect to the policy guidelines, some attention should be given to the possible impact these proposals might have on Federal support programs.

Dr. Rossiter noted that it was the intention of the policy guidelines to reward academic excellence. However, certain of the proposals did consider support programs from the basis of financial need. He noted that the policy guidelines referred to the top 12% of graduate students.

Dr. Parr noted that due to the importance of policy guidelines, it would be useful to have another discussion by a fuller CUA membership. He enquired whether it would be appropriate and possible to add this item to the 5th May agenda.

It was agreed that the Committee members would be asked to consider this matter carefully for the meeting of May 5 and to



prepare final recommendations at that time. It was also noted that due haste would have to be given to this problem since the time limit for implementation was not long.

Mr. Walker noted that the new president of the University of Toronto, Dr. Evans, had made a statement to the effect that approximately 1100 forms were required to complete the Department of Colleges and Universities information requirements. Mr. Walker noted that this number in reality is 369.

### L U N C H E O N

1937 CUA RESPONSE TO COU WITH RESPECT TO STUDY ON YEAR ROUND OPERATION OF UNIVERSITIES

It was noted that a brief response would be appropriate to the COU study of year round operation of universities. The background study on organization of the academic year by COPSE would be used as supporting data, and the Acting Chairman would prepare a memorandum for CUA.

1938 TRENT UNIVERSITY - PROPOSAL FOR DEPARTMENT OF NATIVE STUDIES

The Committee agreed to recommend approval for implementation of this program and noted that it was an indication of an innovative approach to undergraduate planning. It was also noted that Trent University had been successful in receiving substantial outside funding for the program. The Committee agreed that this program should qualify for normal operating support.

1939 GRADUATE FEES AND LETTER TO DR. J. G. PARR FROM DR. R. J. ROSSITER DATED APRIL 11, 1972

Mr. Mitchell noted that a decision to introduce a third-term graduate student fee had been made by the Government without consultation with the Committee on University Affairs. He stated that it was his opinion that the Committee should communicate its displeasure to the Minister about the lack of consultation on important decisions, especially since the Committee's function and role was currently being questioned. Dr. Rossiter added that it was his opinion that the decision to increase the third-term fees was a regressive move considering that the Universities in Ontario are in competition on a Continent-wide basis for graduate students. He also noted that the imposition of a third-term fee would be counter-





productive in terms of Ontario being able to supply its own university professors.

Dr. Rossiter stated that the most serious implication of the introduction of a third-term fee was the fact that the Committee on University Affairs had not been consulted about the desirability of doing so. He stated that this lack of consultation has produced a situation where there is serious question as to what in fact the function of this Committee should be. He noted that if the Committee is to be effective it must retain the credibility of both the Minister and the universities and unless the Committee maintains this credibility there is no purpose for continuing its operation. He concluded by stating that the Committee members were, of course, sensitive that funds are not unlimited. However, the allocation of these funds must be the subject of Committee recommendations.

Mr. Hughes stated that it was his opinion that many people are currently uncertain as to which organizations, in fact, make decisions with respect to matters of higher education. He noted that there was some evidence to suggest that these decisions are now substantially made by the Department of Colleges and Universities, and that this situation was not desirable unless consultation with the Committee is taken beforehand.

Mr. Frost stated that it was his opinion that there was serious question as to the independence of the Committee at this point. He noted that there may be some confusion about the role of the Committee and that this confusion was compounded by the fact that there have been two new Ministers responsible for the Department of Universities and Colleges in a period of one year.

Mr. Mitchell stated that some reconciliation of the role of the Committee must be made at an early opportunity notwithstanding the first-class support offered by the Ministry's staff. He suggested that consideration should perhaps be given to separating more distinctly the Committee operation from the Department. He specifically noted that the Secretariat of the CUA should perhaps be reorganized so that it does not have a connection with the Department.

Mr. Walker concurred that confusion did indeed exist about the role of the Committee on University Affairs.

It was generally agreed that the situation as it had evolved in the recent past was serious to the degree that an attempt would be made to communicate with the Minister about the role



and function of the Committee on University Affairs. Dr. Parr agreed to undertake consultation with the Minister at the earliest opportunity. A report would then be communicated to the rest of the Committee members.

It was generally concluded that since the organizational structures dealing with matters relating to higher education were presently in a period of flux, there was likely to be confusion.

1940 SUMMARY OF WORK OF JOINT CUA/COU SUB-COMMITTEE ON FINANCE  
- OPERATING SUPPORT - REVIEW OF FORMULA GRANTS SYSTEM

Mr. Kidd noted that the joint Sub-Committee on Finance had recommended that work on formula revision should be suspended until such time that recommendations of the Commission on Post-Secondary Education were available. It was agreed that this work would be done and that the Minister should be notified.

Mr. Kidd further noted that the Council of Ontario Universities had requested an interim report should be published on the findings of the Sub-Committee to-date. The Committee agreed that it would not be desirable to publish these interim results and that this decision would be communicated to the Council of Ontario Universities. It was however, agreed that if the Council of Ontario Universities wishes to publish these results, it could do so under its own name.

1941 OTHER BUSINESS - EMERGING GRANT - LAKEHEAD UNIVERSITY

Mr. Kidd noted that the calculation of the emerging grant to Lakehead University would be revised to reflect more up-to-date figures that those utilized earlier. He stated that the net effect would be that Lakehead University would receive an emerging grant which was lower than that originally recommended by the Committee. He also noted that this revision would reflect an administrative change as opposed to a change in principle.

1942 OTHER BUSINESS - FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS - MEDICAL INTERNS  
AND RESIDENTS

A study paper entitled "Report to the Committee on University Affairs on Medical Interns and Residents" was distributed to the Committee members.





Mr. Gordon introduced the subject matter under consideration and noted that while universities are presently claiming BIU income for medical interns and residents, there is no formula fee charged against this income. It was agreed that the CUA should acknowledge this anomaly and that some kind of fee structure should be considered. It was also agreed that the Committee would seek further information from the Senior Coordinating Council on Health Science and would refer this matter to the Joint CUA/COU Sub-committee on Finance - Operating Support for further advice.

1943

POSSIBLE RESPONSE TO TREASURY BOARD DOCUMENT PREPARED BY  
THE POLICY AND PRIORITIES BOARD OF THE CABINET

Mr. Walker noted that it is likely that the Minister will be questioned about the details of the Treasury Board document relating to the work of the Policy and Priorities Committee of the Cabinet. He enquired whether the CUA might wish to advise the Minister about particular points relating to this document. He also noted that there were serious problems as to the meaning of this document and that all efforts should be made to clarify this in the minds of the public.

Dr. Parr suggested that it might be more appropriate for the Department to prepare a statement to the Press outlining the major purpose of this document and thereby achieve some clarification of the issue.

Reference was made to the meeting of the Joint Sub-committee on Finance which was to take place at 4.00 p.m. on April 24, 1972. It was noted that Mr. Hughes would take the place of Dr. Ostry and Dr. Rossiter would replace Mr. Beatty on this Committee, for one meeting only.







## COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

### MINUTES

Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on Friday, 5th May, 1972 with the Council of Ontario Universities in the Huron Room, Macdonald Block, Queen's Park, commencing at 9:45 a.m.

#### Minute PRESENT

1944	Dr. J.G. Parr	Acting Chairman
	Mr. J. O'N. Hughes	
	Dr. M.J. Lavigne	
	Dr. R.J. Rossiter	
	Mr. N.A. Sisco	
	Mr. J.C. Yen	
	Mr. H.H. Walker	Secretary
	Mr. A.P. Gordon	
	Mr. L.M. Johnston	
	Mr. F. Kidd	
	Mr. D. Ferguson	
	Mr. S. Nousiainen	

#### 1945 COUNCIL OF ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES

The Committee met with representatives of the Council of Ontario Universities, comprising the following:

Brock	- A.J. Earp, President
	B.W. Thompson, Department of Geography
Carleton	- A.D. Dunton, President
	J.M. Holmes, Chairman, Department of Chemistry
Guelph	- W.C. Winegard, President
	E.P. Benson, Department of English Language and Literature
Lakehead	-
Laurentian	- E.J. Monahan, President-elect
	- D.H. Williamson, Associate Dean (Science) and Director, Department of Geology
McMaster	- R.C. McIvor, Department of Economics
Ottawa	- R. Guindon, Rector
	M. Patry, Secretary, Faculty of Social Sciences
Queen's	- J.J. Deutsch, Principal
	M. Sayer, Department of Physics
Toronto	-
Trent	- S.T. Robson, Department of History





Waterloo	- B.C. Matthews, President J.C. Gray, Department of English
Western	- D.C. Williams, President (Chairman) T. Collins, Department of English
Windsor	- J.F. Leddy, President L. Smedick, Department of English
York	- D.W. Slater, President H. Adelman, Department of Philosophy

#### Observers

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education	- R.W.B. Jackson, Director
Waterloo Lutheran	- P.B. Healey (for F.C. Peters)

#### Guests

Advisory Committee on Academic Planning	- M.A. Preston, Executive Vice-Chairman
Committee on Research and Planning	- F.A. Ireland, Secretary
Board for Library coordination	- P. Hagen, Chairman
Ontario Council on Graduate Studies	- H.S. Armstrong, Chairman
Committee on Capital Financing	- G.R. Love, Chairman
Task Force-Space and Utilization	- L.G. Macpherson, Chairman

#### Secretariat

J.B. Macdonald, Executive Director  
B.L. Hansen, Director of Research  
G.G. Clarke, Secretary and Research Associate  
J.J. Long, Research Associate  
J. Butcher, Assistant Secretary

Dr. Parr opened the meeting and noted that C.U.A. representation was not complete since many C.U.A. members were unable to attend due to various prior commitments. He also stated that he had asked that C.U.A.'s vacancies be filled. He then asked Dr. Williams to chair the remainder of the meeting.

Dr. Williams noted that the meeting might be short with respect to the information requirements. However, COU had additional items for discussion. He then asked Dr. Macdonald to outline the concerns of the COU with respect to the information requirements.



Dr. Macdonald noted that the forms for information requirements had been widely circulated within the Universities, and many comments had been received. The overall reaction appears to have been that in the current year, the forms were more straightforward than in the past. There were, however, two points of substance on which clarification was required: the information requirements on (1) Citizenship data and (2) Class-size data.

1946

1. CITIZENSHIP DATA

It was noted that since Statistics Canada already has considerable information on citizenship, there is a question as to whether it is useful to duplicate this work on a year-to-year basis through CUA requests. This was an important point since information here could be sensitive. Dr. Leddy noted that this problem was of specific concern to the University of Windsor and requested some clarification.

Mr. Ferguson was asked to outline the basis of the request for data on citizenship, and he, in turn, noted that it was for CUA and COU to decide on the kind of information that it wished.

Dr. Leddy stated that the University of Windsor was concerned that processing the information requests would require a great amount of work. He also stated that aside from this strictly practical consideration he was concerned about the purpose of collecting this information. Father Guindon also expressed concern that the information on citizenship was not clearly stated. Mr. Gordon replied that one reason that Statistics Canada, at least, was attempting to collect information on the basis of citizenship was that immigration policies could be affected by University entrance requirements. Dr. Preston also noted that the Federal Government had been very much concerned with the question of citizenship through its Tri-Council Coordinating Committee and that it might be useful for COU and CUA to get in touch with the Coordinating Committee about the purpose of these requests.

It was generally agreed that some clarification of this matter would be required by CUA and the Ministry before further action would be taken.





The discussion then turned to a general consideration of the basis for data requests. Dr. Slater noted particularly that considerable effort should be given to defining salient issues in higher education before random data collection is undertaken. Dr. Parr suggested that this point should be referred to the Joint CUA/COU Subcommittee on Goals and Policies for Graduate Development, and it was generally agreed that this would be done. Dr. Parr, however, noted that in the coming year, it might be appropriate to make an ad hoc arrangement because of time limitations.

Dr. Matthews noted that it might be desirable to remove some of the data requests pending a clarification of the points noted in the above. Dr. Parr replied that if information on the citizenship of graduate students and faculty were eliminated, there might be an adverse public reaction. He noted that there had been some concern in the minds of the public about the question of citizenship, and it would not be desirable to ignore this issue.

The general discussion continued on the data requests during which it was noted that it would be useful to ask only for information which is not easily available from Statistics Canada. Mr. Ferguson noted that there was a timing problem involved and that the original intention of the Ministry of Colleges and Universities had been to send out these requests by the 8th or 9th of May. Dr. Macdonald suggested that the solution to the problem might be to send out that material which was not under dispute so that routine work could begin. It was agreed that this would be done, and that requests for citizenship information would be deferred until the subject had been reviewed by the Joint Subcommittee.

1947

## 2. CLASS-SIZE DATA

Dr. Williams noted that there are methodological problems which in large part make the data on the section-size analysis meaningless. He read a letter to the Committee indicating the areas of criticism. Dr. Parr noted that it was his personal point of view that since this information was collected last year, it would not need to be collected again in the current year, and



that he would put this to the Committee on University Affairs.

Dr. Matthews enquired whether, on the question of citizenship, the requests would also be held back for the faculty analysis. Dr. Parr noted that he would again emphasize that this question was in the public eye, and care would have to be exercised before a final decision was made.

Mr. Gordon enquired whether it would be appropriate for the Ministry of Colleges and Universities to approach Statistics Canada to obtain the data on Citizenship. He noted that in the past, the Ministry of Colleges and Universities had not utilized Statistics Canada facilities. It was generally agreed that this could be done. However, consultation between CUA and COU would be required to determine the kind of data Statistics Canada would be asked to submit.

Dr. Slater noted that one of the items on the data request was a form relating to anticipated budgets. He enquired whether this was for the 1973-74 budget. Mr. Ferguson replied that this form was concerned with the 1972-73 budget.

Dr. Slater noted that the data requests did not specifically state that long-term enrolment forecasts were necessary. Dr. Parr noted that this was indeed the case, although long-term enrolment forecasts would be available from other sources within the Ministry of Colleges and Universities. Dr. Slater further noted that it would be desirable to have the CUA prepare a macro-projection of enrolments which could be utilized by the Universities as a working assumption in determining individual forecasts. Dr. Parr replied that in the past there had been question whether CUA was in a position to make a confident prediction about future enrolments on a macro basis. He did note however that it might be possible to arrive at a macro forecast and then utilize individual forecasts to obtain points of comparison.

1948

#### GENERAL DISCUSSION

Dr. Parr noted that CUA in the coming year intended to concentrate more on the work of subcommittees than in past years and that it would not travel to the universities. A proposed schedule was distributed to the Committee members.



Dr. Williams noted that the meeting in the fall might not be necessary with COU, and it was agreed that while the schedule would not be changed at this time, it would remain flexible so that the Fall meeting could be cancelled.

Dr. Parr noted that there had been some question as to possible action CUA might take in the event of an enrolment shortfall. While alternatives could be considered in advance, there was very little CUA could do in terms of making recommendations to the Government in absence of actual enrolment figures.

Dr. Slater enquired whether it was possible for the Universities to submit alternative methods of dealing with a potential shortfall. It was generally agreed that any and all input would be useful to both CUA and COU.

Dr. Williams enquired whether the Ministry of Colleges and Universities could give any indication of a BIU value for 1973-74. Mr. Walker replied that the Minister had written to the Management Board about this matter so that the Universities might be notified by May of 1972. Dr. Slater enquired whether the Management Board, in its consideration of the possible BIU value, had given consideration to matters such as increases in costs resulting from policy decisions made in other Ministries. He specifically noted that Hydro costs had risen in the past year and enquired whether the Management Board would take this kind of increase into account. He also noted that the Universities do not have control over many of the items of expenditure, and that a new BIU value should reflect these variables. Mr. Walker replied that it would be desirable for the Universities to make a joint statement to the Minister pointing out their concerns as explicitly as possible.

Dr. Winegard noted that he had been instructed by his board to enquire whether the CUA had been consulted about the third-term fee and what the role of CUA had been in this decision. Dr. Parr replied that the CUA had not been directly consulted about the implementation of the third-term fee. He then outlined the procedures which were followed by CUA in its recommendations of 1972-73 and noted that the CUA had been concerned that if there were further reductions to be made these would impose hardships on the Universities. He also noted that





the CUA would be meeting with the Minister later in the day to discuss this problem.

Dr. Matthews enquired whether it was likely that an answer would be forthcoming on the increase in the teaching assistantship level in the third term. It was noted that the Minister was meeting with COU for luncheon later in the day, and that an announcement might be expected at that time. It was also noted that in the event COU wished CUA to consider these problems further, it would be appropriate to refer them to CUA, which was meeting in the afternoon.

A general discussion ensued on formula fees related to median fees. There was some confusion as to whether Universities were now free to charge any fee level that they wished. CUA was asked to clarify the implementation of fee increases at its meeting in the afternoon, and to make appropriate recommendations to the Minister.

Dr. Earp noted that Dr. Parr had written to the emerging Universities requesting possible alternatives for meeting long-term problems of emerging institutions. He enquired whether further action was forthcoming. Dr. Parr replied that, to date, it had not been possible to analyze this problem in depth although this would be done in the near future. Dr. Parr also stated that he wished to enquire from COU whether in the event of a short-fall, it would be appropriate for COU to consider how best to meet the likely problems which would arise for the emerging institutions. Dr. Macdonald replied that some work had been conducted on this problem although to a limited degree. Dr. Slater added that the emerged universities, while being sympathetic to the problems of the emerging ones, could do only so much since they were constrained by the formula system. Dr. Parr reiterated his point that COU should be in a position to offer CUA viable alternatives in the event of enrolment shortfalls.

Professor Williamson enquired whether CUA had suggestions for the Northern Universities on how best to reverse the flow of students to the South. Dr. Parr noted that this will certainly be a component of the discussion when CUA attempts to rationalize the problems of the emerging Universities. He also stated that COU had a role to play in this consideration



and particularly noted that some of the admissions policies of the larger universities were not helpful to the smaller institutions.

Dr. Slater noted that this consideration made clear one of the failings of the formula system, and that in the long term, a solution might be to fund universities on an institution or program basis. Dr. Deutsch suggested that the problems of the emerging institutions might also be alleviated if budgeting were done on agreed projections calculated one year earlier, and corrections made to the subsequent budget. Dr. Rossiter agreed that this system might be desirable. However, there would be major problems in reaching agreement on what the actual projections would, in fact, be. He also noted that some of the smaller institutions might give more thought to better recruiting policies, especially those policies which would emphasize the attractiveness of a more personalized university setting.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

.....  
Chairman

.....  
Secretary

Final Copy









# COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

## MINUTES

Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on Friday, 5th May, 1972, in the Board Room of the Committee on University Affairs, commencing at 12:00 noon.

### Minute     PRESENT

1949	Dr. J. Gordon Parr	Acting Chairman
	Mr. P. Beatty	
	The Honourable L.M. Frost, Q.C.	
	Mr. J. O'N. Hughes	
	Dr. M.J. Lavigne	
	Dr. R.J. Rossiter	
	Mr. N.A. Sisco	
	Mr. J.C. Yen	
	Mr. H.H. Walker	Secretary
	Mr. A.P. Gordon	
	Mr. F. Kidd	
	Mr. J.D. McCullough	

### 1950     THIRD TERM GRADUATE STUDENT FEE AND REMUNERATION FOR TEACHING ASSISTANTS

Dr. Parr opened the meeting and noted that the Minister had now made his statement to the universities which allowed the universities to grant a bursary in the amount of \$300 to graduate students enrolled in a third term. The Minister's statement also indicated that teaching assistantship levels would be allowed to increase to a level of \$2,400. Considerable discussion ensued on the Minister's announcement, and the Committee members noted that it would be essential to clarify certain aspects of at least the new fee regulation, particularly as it applied to median fees to be charged by universities. It was agreed that the Committee members would consider these questions over luncheon.

LUNCHEON



Dr. Parr noted that the Presidents of the universities of Ontario had requested that some clarification be given to the problem of whether universities be allowed to set their own fees or whether the fee increase must be absorbed by the student. It was agreed that, in general, the fee increase would be charged to the student.\*

1951      THE APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF  
MONDAY, 24TH APRIL, 1972

The Committee approved the minutes of the meeting of April 24th, 1972.

1952      BASIC INCOME UNIT VALUE - 1973/74

Dr. Parr reminded the Committee members that in its earlier recommendations with respect to B.I.U. levels, the Committee had agreed that the increase in value for 1973/74 should reflect a price index increase. He noted that the Committee should now be more specific about this recommendation.

Considerable discussion ensued on this problem, during which Dr. Rossiter noted that since universities are already facing deficit budgets, anything less than an increase in the consumer price index would not be realistic.

Dr. Parr stated that as an interim measure, he would inform the Minister that the Committee wishes to make a recommendation on the kind of index which should be utilized for assessing the 1973/74 B.I.U. value but that further work will be required. He agreed to work with Mr. Kidd to develop an index. It was agreed that since time limitations would not permit another meeting before a final recommendation would be made, it would be appropriate to contact the Committee members by telephone.

---

\*note that this subject is further discussed on page 5





1953      POLICY GUIDELINES FOR GRADUATE STUDENT  
SUPPORT (FINAL REPORT OF JOINT CUA/COU  
SUB-COMMITTEE ON GOALS AND POLICIES FOR  
GRADUATE DEVELOPMENT)

Dr. Parr stated that this item had been discussed at the last Committee meeting. However, since Committee representation was small at that time, it had been agreed that Dr. Rossiter again outline the proposal. Dr. Rossiter then described the basis for policy guidelines and emphasized that the nature of this program was to reward academic excellence and that it would be competitive in structure.

It was agreed that the Committee accepted the policy guidelines in principle although it was possible that the Government may not wish to allocate the requested sum of 4.5 million dollars for this program.

1954      APPROVAL OF NEW GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Ph.D. Agricultural Economics, University  
of Guelph

The Committee noted that the Advisory Committee on Academic Planning had now submitted a recommendation for approval of funding for this particular program. The ACAP recommendation appeared to be sound, and the Committee therefore agreed to recommend support for this program.

M.A. and Ph.D. Social and Political  
Thought, York University

ACAP had submitted reports on both these programs and recommended that the M.A. be funded beginning in 1972/73 but that the commencement of the Ph.D. program should be postponed. It was agreed that the Committee would recommend to the Minister that formula support should be granted to the M.A. program but that a decision on the Ph.D. program be deferred.



1955      PROCEDURES FOR INITIATION OF NEW GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Dr. Parr noted that guidelines for initiation of new graduate programs had been redrafted and a copy of these guidelines was distributed to the Committee Members, dated May 2nd, 1972. Dr. Parr further noted that additional revisions will be necessary before a final set of procedures is ready. It was agreed that this redrafting would be done and that a final report would be submitted at the next Committee meeting.

1956      FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR CHURCH-RELATED POST-SECONDARY EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

A letter from the Minister dated April 12th, 1972, was distributed to the Committee members. The Minister sought the advice of the Committee on how best to deal with the problem of providing financial support for church-related institutions on a long-term basis. It was agreed that a sub-committee would be formed in the near future, which would report back to the CUA.

1957      TRENT UNIVERSITY - CANADIAN STUDIES

Dr. Parr noted that Trent University had initiated a new program in Canadian Studies. He stated that this program would not require extra formula support and that Trent had received a grant of \$150,000 from the Ford Motor Company. It was agreed that the Committee would recommend to the Minister that an acknowledgement should be made to indicate that this program is an example of innovation of a highly desirable nature.

1958      STUDENT HOUSING PRIORITIES

A memorandum dated April 26th, 1972 entitled "Student Housing Priorities, 1972" was distributed to Committee



members. Mr. McCullough outlined the basis of the memorandum and asked that these priorities be approved so that construction could proceed once formula funds were available. The Committee agreed to recommend the priorities as outlined in the memorandum.

1959

CLASS SIZE DATA

Dr. Parr noted that during the morning's discussion with the Council of Ontario Universities, it had been agreed that the class size data had served its purpose and that collection of this data in the coming year would not be necessary. The Committee agreed to communicate this recommendation to the Ministry.

At this point in the meeting, the Honourable George Kerr was introduced to the Committee members.

Dr. Parr noted that at the CUA meeting of 24th April, 1972, it was agreed that the Acting Chairman would communicate the concern of the Committee to the Minister about the lack of consultation with respect to the decision to implement a third-term fee. Dr. Parr stated that he had now consulted with the Minister and that the Minister had asked if he might respond to the Committee. He then asked Mr. Kerr to discuss the issue further. Mr. Kerr stated that the decision to implement a third-term fee had been taken without consultation largely because there was little time for consultation following his meeting with the Management Board. He stated that the introduction of the third-term fee had been considered more desirable than increasing the loan limit which was another major alternative. He noted that there was no question but that the Committee should, however, have been consulted and that all efforts would be made in future to facilitate consultation.





Dr. Parr responded to the Minister and noted that the Committee appreciated the Minister's remarks with respect to the consultation.

Dr. Rossiter observed that the Committee members did appreciate the Minister's position and the problem of attempting to form a budget within a constrained time limit. He stated that the Committee had been concerned that the new regulations appeared to penalize graduate students but the situation now appears to have been ameliorated in a commendable manner although universities on the whole will still experience budget difficulties since they, in a large measure, are already in a deficit position.

Mr. Kerr noted that during his discussions with the Council of Ontario Universities, a problem had arisen with respect to establishing a fee level for the general \$100 increase. Dr. Parr replied that the Committee was considering the matter and that at this stage the feeling was that while a floating fee structure might have some attractions, it seemed more desirable to establish a more uniform scale of fees for the universities. In addition, he noted that the Committee appeared to be of the opinion that the student, as opposed to the institution, should be asked to carry the increase in fees. It was agreed that the \$100 increase should be absorbed by the student and that the universities would be expected to charge the student \$100 more in 1972-73 than in 1971-72. It was appreciated that this would imply a Government jurisdiction on fees and the entire question of fee structure would be the subject of a joint subcommittee's review.

The discussion then turned to the effective starting date for the third-term fee. Dr. Parr noted that the members of the Council of



Ontario Universities are unanimous that this fee should not be implemented until the summer term of 1973. It was further agreed that even for those students who are currently in the system, the earliest starting date would be the summer of 1973.

Mr. Frost enquired about a report in the Toronto Globe and Mail that Waterloo Lutheran University might now become a provincially-supported institution. Mr. Kerr replied that discussions are currently being held between officials of the Ministry and the University about possible new funding arrangements.

1960

RYERSON POLYTECHNICAL INSTITUTE - DEGREE  
NAME

Dr. Parr noted that the Ryerson Polytechnical Institute had earlier requested that consideration might be given to a degree name change but he had now been notified that the Academic Council had not agreed to changing the present degree name. Mr. Kerr reported that he had already been informed of the decision.

Dr. Rossiter noted that the Presidents are concerned that the BIU value should be set for 1973-74 in the near future. An additional problem is that in the event the universities might suffer a shortfall in enrolments in September of 1972, some thought should be given to providing a safeguard. He stated that the slip-year scheme in a modified version might be one such safeguard or it might be desirable to guarantee enrolments established in a prior year.

Dr. Parr stated that this matter, together with the problem of emerging universities, would be discussed during the summer months and it is hoped that the Committee could then make firm proposals.



The meeting concluded at 4:30 p.m.

.....  
Chairman

.....  
Secretary

Final copy.









## COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

### MINUTES

Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on Tuesday, 6th June, 1972 in the Library, Royal Botanical Gardens, Hamilton, commencing at 9:30 a.m.

#### Minute

#### Present

1961

Dr. J. Gordon Parr  
Mr. W. Dodge  
Dr. R. Gerstein  
Dr. M. Lavigne  
Mr. J. O'N. Hughes  
Mr. R. W. Mitchell  
Dr. R.J. Rossiter  
Mr. N.A. Sisco

Acting Chairman

Mr. H.H. Walker  
Mr. A.P. Gordon  
Mr. L.M. Johnston  
Mr. D.J. McCullough  
Mr. S. Nousiainen

Secretary

1962

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF FRIDAY, 5th MAY, 1972.

The Committee approved the Minutes of the 5th May, 1972, meeting.

1963

APPROVAL OF FINAL "PROCEDURES FOR INITIATION OF NEW GRADUATE PROGRAMS"

A document entitled "Procedures for Initiation of New Graduate Programs" was distributed to the Committee members. Dr. Parr noted that this particular document was now complete, following a number of revisions and, subject to editorial changes, would, hopefully, represent the position of the Committee on new program approvals. He noted that in the event that this set of procedures is accepted, the Committee would no longer have to review individual program submissions from universities but would simply approve a "package" of procedures which would ensure that rational forward planning is being carried out in new program development.

Some discussion ensued on the procedures for initiation of new graduate programs, during which it was noted that there was great concern about the length of time that it takes to prepare an assessment of a particular discipline. It was also noted that planning assessments were extremely costly.



Dr. Parr stated that he would soon be meeting with the joint CUA/COU Subcommittee on Goals and Policies for Graduate Development and that the problem of planning assessments would be discussed at this time. He also stated that he was concerned about what, in fact, the outcome of a planning assessment would be, and whether the same results could not be achieved through other means.

It was agreed that the Committee was in general agreement with the principles outlined in the statement entitled "Procedures for Initiation of New Graduate Programs", but it would be desirable to prepare a statement to accompany this document, emphasizing that the speed of planning assessments must somehow be improved.

1964

PH.D. POLITICAL SCIENCE, McMASTER UNIVERSITY

Dr. Parr referred to a memorandum outlining the basis of the McMaster request for funding of 18 Ph.D. students enrolled in the Ph.D. Program in Political Science at McMaster and noted that while the Committee might want to discuss the issue at this time, a final decision should preferably wait until a presentation were made by McMaster later in the day. Considerable discussion ensued on McMaster's request during which Dr. Rossiter noted that it was his opinion that McMaster University had proceeded improperly in recruiting students before approval for funding had been given.

Dr. Gerstein noted that there was evidence to suggest that the Ph.D. Program at McMaster was of excellent quality, considering the number of students who had enrolled in the program.

It was generally agreed that at the time McMaster had decided to implement the program, there had been considerable confusion as to what procedures, in fact, should have been followed. It was noted that a new set of procedures for new program implementation was currently in the process of being prepared and that this kind of situation would probably not arise again.

Dr. Parr summed up by suggesting four alternatives which the Committee could consider:

- (a) no recommendation for funding.
- (b) total payment for the 18 students and a recommendation for approval of the program in general.





- (c) fund those students only which McMaster University had recruited prior to the announcement of the embargo.
- (d) fund those students who had begun their programs before the announcement of the embargo but from 1972/73 on only.

1965

CUA RESPONSE TO COPSE REPORT ON NORTH-WESTERN  
ONTARIO, REVIEW OF WORK OF SUBCOMMITTEE

A memorandum entitled "Committee on University Affairs, Post-Secondary Education, North-Western Ontario" was distributed to the Committee members. Dr. Rossiter outlined the basis of this memorandum and noted that it had been the opinion of the Subcommittee that the proposal from COPSE on a single governing board would be unworkable. It was also the Subcommittee's opinion that care should be exercised when contemplating a fusion of a university with a college, since the purposes and objectives of each of these institutions were different.

Considerable discussion ensued on the proposals submitted in the memorandum, during which it was noted that the Council of Regents had made recommendations which were, in essence, similar to those found in this memorandum. Mr. Sisco stated that the only difference between the two reports was that the decisions on capital use and allocation would be made by the Ministry of Colleges and Universities as opposed to a joint coordinating committee proposed in the memorandum under discussion.

The Committee then discussed a number of the recommendations in detail, which led to the following comments:

Recommendation No. 3 - "That a joint co-ordinating committee be established and that all proposed new capital projects be channelled to the Minister of Colleges and Universities through this Committee. The joint co-ordinating committee should also re-examine the existing plans for capital development of both institutions".

With respect to this recommendation, it was suggested that if the work of this body was to be effective, it would, of necessity, need power over individual senates and boards.



Recommendation No. 1 - "That Lakehead University and Confederation College continue in their present administrative structure".

It was argued that while the COPSE report had advocated a unified board, there was question as to the desirability of this move since the aims and objectives of colleges are different from those of universities. Mr. Sisco further noted that not only are aims and objectives different, but basic operating principles are different and that it was difficult to see how to resolve this issue. As an example, he observed that the faculty at one of the institutions bargains collectively whereas the faculty of the other institution does not do so.

Recommendation No. 4 - "That a co-ordinated policy concerning extension services be established with one director of extension to serve both institutions. The director would co-ordinate extension programs which could lead either to a degree from Lakehead University or a diploma from Confederation College".

The substance of this recommendation was discussed at some length, and agreed to.

Recommendation No. 5 - "That extra formula grants be made available for these extension services to offset the added costs resulting from the great distances involved".

It was agreed that the Committee had already addressed itself to this problem and that there was no difficulty in recommending implementation.

Recommendation No. 6 - "That as far as practicable, the diploma programs at Lakehead be transferred to Confederation College".

Dr. Rossiter noted that implementation of this recommendation might be difficult since it involves the generation of B.I.U.'s on the basis of student enrolments. In essence, this arrangement would generate more income for Confederation College at the expense of Lakehead University. Dr. Rossiter suggested, however, that this recommendation is sound, since Lakehead University has diploma programs rather as a result of historical developments than as a practical need for them. Dr. Parr observed that while in theory, separation of diploma courses from Lakehead University makes considerable sense, the practical effect of doing so might be problematical. As an example, he noted that one effect of moving



engineering diploma students away from Lakehead University would be to reduce enrolments in the Lakehead Engineering degree program to levels which could be too low for a viable program in engineering to continue. He added that there might be problems in terms of transfer of staff also.

The Committee then agreed that more attention would have to be given to Recommendation No. 3, and specifically to the way in which the recommendation might be implemented. It was further agreed that Recommendation No 6 deserved further attention; and the Committee agreed that it would be appropriate to examine all programs at both institutions as to the practicability of transfer. It was agreed that an ad hoc sub-committee of CUA and Council of Regents might do this work.

Lastly, it was noted that a general meeting of the Committee was not necessary before the recommendations were sent to the Minister.

1966

#### EMERGING UNIVERSITIES

Dr. Parr stated that he had now received letters from the emerging universities outlining suggestions for possible alternative funding patterns for future years. It was agreed that this subject matter was of great importance and that it would be useful to meet with the delegates from emerging universities as soon as possible. Monday, June 26th, appeared to be an appropriate date for this meeting.

#### McMASTER UNIVERSITY DELEGATION

Dr. Helmuth and Dr. Lee were introduced to the Committee members. Dr. Helmuth outlined the basis of McMaster's request for funding of the Ph.D. students in Political Science. He particularly noted that the McMaster request is concerned not so much with the lifting of the embargo on the program but that since both the Province and the University bear a responsibility for the future of the students involved in the program, they should therefore also carry the appropriate financial burden.

Dr. Parr acknowledged Dr. Helmuth's point and noted that the Committee had given this matter considerable attention during the past twelve months and that it was hoped that a final decision could be made.





Dr. Gerstein enquired about the apparent popularity of the program and enquired whether this popularity was based on the quality of the faculty involved. Dr. Lee responded that undoubtedly the two senior professors were responsible for attracting students to the program. He also noted that most of the students were Canadian.

Considerable discussion ensued about procedures for new graduate program implementation as they had existed prior to March, 1971, and it was suggested that the McMaster Ph.D. program might be a special case. Dr. Rossiter particularly noted that since McMaster had received favourable appraisal by ACAP in January, 1970, it could conceivably have enrolled students in the Fall of September, 1970 in which event, this problem would not have arisen. It was, however, countered that the reason McMaster did not recruit students in September, 1970, was that the ACAP appraisal had been conditional that the program not be initiated until 1971. The delegation from McMaster University withdrew at this point and Dr. Parr indicated that in the event that the Committee required further documentation it would contact McMaster University.

The Committee agreed that the situation at McMaster with respect to the Ph.D. program in Political Science should be resolved by recommending funding for the students who were recruited prior to the announcement of the embargo and that this funding should be provided until such time that the students had finished their work. Further, the effective starting date for funding would be September, 1972. It was also agreed that the Committee would request that the names of the students involved should be submitted to the Ministry of Colleges and Universities.

The meeting concluded at 12:30 p.m.







## COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

### MINUTES

Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on Monday, 26th June, 1972 in the Board Room of the Committee on University Affairs commencing at 10:00 a.m.

#### Minute

#### Present

1967

Dr. J. Gordon Parr, Acting Chairman  
Mr. W. Dodge  
The Honourable Leslie M. Frost, P.C., Q.C.  
Dr. R. Gerstein  
Dr. J.M. Holmes  
Dr. M.J. Lavigne  
Professor W.R. Lederman  
Mr. R.W. Mitchell  
Dr. R.J. Rossiter  
Mr. N.A. Sisco  
Mr. J.C. Yen  
Mr. H.H. Walker, Secretary  
Mr. L.M. Johnston  
Mr. D.J. McCullough  
Mr. R.E.R. Crate  
Mr. I. Joshua  
Mr. D. Newson  
Mr. S. Nousiainen

1968

The Committee received the following delegations:

Brock University: Dr. A.J. Earp,  
Acting President and Provost  
Mr. R.A. Nairn,  
Chief Administrative Officer

Trent University: Mr. R.H. Sadleir,  
Vice President  
Mr. J.E. Leishman,  
Vice President, Finance  
Professor W. Pitman,  
Dean Designate

Lakehead University: Dr. Tamblyn,  
Mr. B. Mason,  
Executive Assistant to the President  
Mr. G. Thompson,  
Comptroller





Laurentian University: Dr. H. Albert,  
Vice President Academic  
Dr. E.J. Monahan,  
President  
Mr. C. Nurmi,  
Comptroller

1969

EMERGING UNIVERSITIES

Following introductions, Dr. Parr stated that the Committee on University Affairs has been concerned about the problems of the emerging universities and that he had written to these universities requesting information on how they might best reach viable scales of operation. He noted that two courses of action were open to the Committee, these being:

- (a) to recommend that funding be provided to the emerging universities until such time that these universities reach the previously determined levels of emergence, or
- (b) that some other financial scheme be devised which would recognize that the emerging universities might be required to live within smaller enrolment levels.

In response to Dr. Parr's comments, Dr. Tamblyn noted that it was the opinion of Lakehead University that present levels for emergence should be maintained and if there is to be a departure from this pattern, Lakehead would find itself in a difficult position since all program planning has been based on this premise.

Dr. Earp added that the emerging universities were now having to cope with an additional problem, this being the recent downturn in enrolments. He stated that only a year ago, Brock University was confident that it would soon reach emergence. However, due to the new situation, it was now not possible to be accurate about a date for emergence.



Representatives from Trent University further noted that at that particular institution, the present level of emergence (4,000 B.I.U.s) would not, in any case, be sufficient for operation to continue on a viable scale. Mr. Leishman stated that Trent University would request a re-negotiation of the level at which emergence would take place.

Dr. Rossiter responded to the foregoing comments and noted that levels of emergence prior to 1972/73 had been enrolment-based but in 1972/73 these levels had been modified to conform to a time scale. He stated that there was now question as to whether levels of emergence should again be based on enrolment. He further stated that he was encouraged by those Institutions which had accepted the existing emergence levels but was concerned about the contention of Trent University that an emergence level of 4,000 B.I.U.s would not be sufficient.

Mr. Leishman replied to Dr. Rossiter's comments and stated that since the nature of the Trent program is considerably different from that of other universities, it was the opinion of Trent University that, taking into consideration problems of scale, an emergence level of 5,000 B.I.U.s might be more acceptable. He added that Trent could support its case by referring to the average B.I.U. weighting which is only 1.23, the lowest in the Province. Dr. Parr responded by stating that, although the average weighting at Trent might indeed be low, it was also true that responsibilities with respect to graduate work, for example, were fewer at Trent than at the older universities.

Mr. Pitman stated that Trent University had set itself a goal of educational innovation, and if Trent were asked to reduce its number of limited enrolment courses, this goal would be jeopardized. Dr. Rossiter replied that while the C.U.A. has indeed attempted to encourage innovation and diversity, there was serious question as to whether this should cost more. Dr. Parr further added that, while Trent University might make a special claim for its case, it was equally true that other universities could do so also.



Dr. Parr summarized this part of the discussion and noted that the current levels of emergence had been set in a period when the universities and government could be certain that enrolment growths would continue indefinitely. He stated that since the situation had now changed, it was imperative that new ways should be found for looking at the emerging universities. He enquired whether it might be possible for the emerging universities to find some way of monitoring viability of existing levels of enrolment.

Dr. Tamblyn responded to Dr. Parr's comments and noted that the situation at Lakehead University would be considerably improved were the Faculty of Education at that institution funded in a different manner. He suggested that another alternative might be to drop the Faculty altogether since it was not generating sufficient income to justify the cost. Mr. Frost enquired whether, in the event that Lakehead University were to drop its Faculty of Education, it would then be a viable operation. Dr. Tamblyn replied that this would be the case.

Mr. Walker next enquired whether the Lakehead University has an agreement with the Minister of Education that the Faculty of Education should not be a burden on the University's financial situation. Dr. Tamblyn stated that he was under the understanding that this was the case, although no clarification had yet been received from the Department of Education.

Dr. Gerstein stated that it was her view that it was not very useful to conceptualize the four universities as each being essentially of the same kind. She stated that, while many of the problems experienced by the universities are similar, there were distinct differences in the goals and objectives set by each institution and the mode of operation of each institution. She then noted that it would be most useful for the universities to give thought to what it is that each institution is attempting to do and with what justification. She noted that having done this, the emerging universities might be in a better position to justify its request for extra consideration. In this way, too, Dr. Gerstein noted that unique solutions might be found for unique institutional problems.





Mr. Dodge referred to Dr. Gerstein's comments and noted that it might now be desirable to break away from past patterns of support to the emerging universities. He enquired whether the emerging universities might be receptive to an individualized approach and whether it would be advantageous to move away from the concept of formula financing.

Dr. Tamblyn replied that in the opinion of Lakehead University, the concept of formula financing is a sound one and should not be undermined. Dr. Earp also noted that Brock University favors the formula approach to financing but could possibly consider releasing a number of the faculty.

Dr. Parr referred to Dr. Earp's comments and stated that an alternative to releasing staff would be to redeploy the staff in some way. Dr. Earp replied that it isn't possible to do this since there are no positions of any kind available at the University. He furthermore pointed out that the problem was of such magnitude that measures of this kind would not help the university in a meaningful way.

The representatives from Laurentian University noted that it would not be desirable to move away from a formula approach but consideration should be given to revising or setting a new minimum weight at 1.5 B.I.U.'s per student.

Considerable discussion then ensued on the present method of calculating emergent grants during which it was noted that while in 1972/73 the calculation had originally been based on a time scale, the total effect was to allocate to the emerging universities roughly that amount of money which they would have derived had the calculations been conducted on an enrolment base.

Dr. Rossiter concluded this portion of the discussion by noting that the problem at the emerging universities is in a sense part of a larger problem which is affecting all universities in the Province. He stated that other universities in the system might also be compelled to reduce the number of faculty



members retained, and that this problem was something not experienced strictly by the emerging institutions. Dr. Earp replied that this was indeed the case but that the emerging universities suffer from further difficulties, one such difficulty being that none of the emerging universities has as yet reached a viable scale of operations.

Considerable discussion ensued on possible ways of helping the emerging universities during which it was noted that one solution would be to revise the average weight generated by a student. Another solution which was discussed was the possibility of regulating unfair recruiting practices within the university system. It was noted that due to the special circumstances of the emerging universities, the existing recruiting practices favoured the older established institutions as opposed to the newer ones. Lastly, it was suggested that in future years, it might be appropriate to fund the universities on a basis of a predetermined forecast of enrolment and that some penalty might be attached to discourage overly optimistic enrolment forecasting.

Mr. Pitman noted that the Committee on University Affairs, in considering patterns of future support to the emerging universities should give serious consideration to the social direction in which the Province is moving. He stated that if cost considerations are of primary importance, it would then make considerable sense to locate all institutions in Toronto. This alternative, however, would negate all intentions the Province might have in terms of regional aims and goals and the development of a diverse range of educational program offerings and settings to the population of Ontario. He furthermore stated that the Committee, in preparing recommendations, should give serious consideration to the danger of creating first- and second-rate institutions within the Provincial system. He noted that when the emerging universities were established, assurances had been given that these institutions would be developed into first-rate universities.

Dr. Tamblyn added to Mr. Pitman's comments and noted



that even now it was possible to justify the higher costs of operating emerging institutions on the basis of the kind of special services they provide to the population of Ontario.

Dr. Rossiter concluded the discussion by thanking the emerging universities for their views and stated that the Committee would give sympathetic consideration to the problems of the emerging universities and would hopefully be in a position to offer a solution which would be satisfactory to all concerned.

The delegations from the emerging universities withdrew from the meeting at this point.

Some discussion ensued on possible courses of action which could be taken with respect to the problems of the emerging universities in future years. Dr. Rossiter stated that he would prefer some method which would be based on enrolment levels likely to be generated at the emerging universities. It was agreed that the problems of the emerging universities would be discussed further within the context of the C.U.A. subcommittee on Finance-Operating Support. Dr. Gerstein added that the C.U.A. subcommittee on Finance-Operating Support might give consideration to funding a particular "program" as opposed to using some other method.

1970

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF 6TH JUNE, 1972

Dr. Parr noted that Mr. Gordon had requested that page 6 of the draft minutes of the meeting of June 6, 1972 be revised so that a reading of these **minutes** would indicate that the Committee on University Affairs "recommend" funding as opposed to "approving" funding. It was also noted that Mr. Gordon had requested that the minutes be revised so that it would be clear that the Ministry of Colleges and Universities would be asked to obtain the necessary information concerning the students involved in the Ph.D. program in Political Science at McMaster University. It was agreed that these changes would be made and that the minutes would then be approved.





1971 PROPOSAL FROM C.O.U. REGARDING GRADUATE FEE INCREASE

A letter from the Council of Ontario Universities dated June 12, 1972, was distributed to the Committee members. Dr. Parr stated that this letter had been discussed at a recent meeting of the Joint CUA/COU Subcommittee on Finance-Operating Support and that it had been decided at that meeting that it would not be appropriate to ask the Minister to re-negotiate a new value for the 1973/74 B.I.U. at this time.

Mr. Joshua distributed a memorandum entitled "Data re Proposed Changes in Graduate Fees" and summarized the contents of this memorandum. Some discussion ensued on the memorandum following which it was agreed that there should be no change in the recommendations of the C.U.A. as they relate to fee levels for 1972-73. It was furthermore agreed that the Committee would, however, reconsider fee levels and structures in September of 1972 as they might be applicable in following years.

Dr. Rossiter noted that when the Committee is in a position to begin a re-assessment of fee levels, it would be desirable that the total fee to be charged per program within the Ontario system should not deviate greatly from fees charged in other jurisdictions.

1972 PRELIMINARY REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHURCH-RELATED INSTITUTIONS

Dr. Parr distributed a memorandum dated June 26, 1972 entitled "Record of Subcommittee on Church-related Meeting of June 25, 1972", and stated that the work of the Subcommittee on the problems of church-related institutions is progressing and that it was probable that more specific recommendations would be available by September of 1972. He added that the Subcommittee would appreciate any views that the C.U.A. members might have with respect to this matter in the meantime.

Mr. Frost noted that in considering future patterns of support to church-related institutions, some consideration would have to be given to the possible implications that these patterns might have for secondary education.



Some discussion ensued on the problems of the church-related institutions during which Mr. Mitchell noted that any recommendation which might eventually be made by the C.U.A. to the Government should consider the contribution that the church-related institutions are currently making in the area of post-secondary education in Ontario. It was also noted that many of the church-related colleges no longer have a religious affiliation, although the case of Waterloo Lutheran University would not conform to this generalization.

It was then noted that the Committee had received the preliminary report on church-related institutions and would be free to comment on this report prior to the Subcommittee meeting in the Fall of 1972. It was furthermore agreed that Mr. Frost would join the deliberations of the Subcommittee and that a final report with recommendations would hopefully be issued in early August of 1972. Lastly, it was agreed that any solution which might be forthcoming probably would not recommend emerging grants nor eligibility for capital support.

1973

OPERATING SUPPORT - RYERSON POLYTECHNICAL INSTITUTE

Mr. Joshua distributed a memorandum to the Committee members dated June 23rd, 1972 entitled "Operating Grants Formula for Ryerson". He noted that the basis of this memorandum was an attempt to determine a scale of support to Ryerson Polytechnical Institution which would be consistent with the amount of funds generated on behalf of universities and C.A.A.T.S. within the Provincial system. It was, however, agreed that while some consistency between universities and C.A.A.T.S. was necessary in considering the levels of operating support to Ryerson Polytechnical Institution, there would be some difference since Ryerson did not fit either pattern fully.

It was then agreed that the purpose of this memorandum was to generate sufficient income for Ryerson Polytechnical Institution so that it could maintain a viable scale of operation, but which would, at the same time, recognize the unique situation of Ryerson Polytechnical Institution. It was, therefore, agreed that the weighting scheme as described in Appendix B of the memorandum best reflected the needs of Ryerson Polytechnical Institute and that a recommendation would be



made to the Minister according to this weighting scheme.

Mr. Frost enquired whether, at a future meeting of the C.U.A., it might be possible to discuss the question of sabbatical leave and tenure as it relates to Ryerson Polytechnical Institute. It was agreed that this question would form the basis of a future agenda item.

1974

EXTRA-FORMULA SUPPORT FOR BILINGUAL INSTITUTIONS

A memorandum dated June 23rd, 1972, entitled "Extra-Formula Support for Bilingual Institutions" was distributed to the Committee members. It was agreed that this memorandum would be discussed at the next meeting of the Committee.

1975

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO - FORMULA WEIGHT FOR COMBINED ARTS AND SCIENCE PROGRAM

Mr. Crate was asked to describe the substance of the recent recommendation of the Joint CUA/COU Subcommittee on Finance-Operating Support as it relates to the recommendation to increase the weight for the combined Arts and Science Program to 1.24. Mr. Crate noted that the University of Toronto was contacted about this particular weight and found it acceptable. He noted that it would be desirable if the new formula weight could be approved for 1972/73.

Considerable discussion ensued on the revision of the formula weight for the University of Toronto during which it was noted that further calculations would be necessary before a final recommendation could be made. It was then concluded that it would not be possible to recommend a new formula weight for 1972/73 but that for 1973/74, a change may be possible. It was agreed that this item would be discussed at a later date.

1976

ONTARIO FEDERATION OF STUDENTS - REPRESENTATION TO C.U.A.

Dr. Parr noted that he had received a request from the Ontario Federation of Students that they be allowed to make representation to the C.U.A. on behalf of the student body in Ontario. It was agreed that it would be appropriate to attempt to determine the degree to which this organization was representative of the interests of Ontario students and that thought would be given to the general problem before the next meeting of the Committee.





1977

UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH - REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO  
INCREASE ONTARIO VETERINARY COLLEGE FRESHMAN INTAKE

A memorandum requesting permission to increase the O.V.C. freshman intake to <sup>100</sup> students commencing in the Fall of 1972 was distributed to the Committee members. Considerable discussion ensued about the contents of the memorandum during which it was noted that the Committee would have no objection to this increase. During the discussion, it was also noted that approval of freshman intake is not considered in the context of the Health-Sciences Programs as an example, and therefore it is presumably not something that the C.U.A. wishes to do in the case of the O.V.C. request. It is also noted that an increase in the O.V.C. freshman intake might produce a request for further capital funding.

1978

RESPONSE OF C.U.A. TO THE C.O.P.S.E. REPORT ON NORTH  
BAY AND SAULT STE. MARIE

Dr. Parr stated that he had received a request from the Minister for a C.U.A. response to the C.O.P.S.E. report on Post-Secondary Education in North Bay and Sault Ste. Marie. It was agreed that a Subcommittee of the C.U.A. would be struck to consider this request and that it would meet on the evening of 24th July, 1972. It was furthermore agreed that the C.U.A. would meet sometime on Tuesday, July 25th to consider the work of the Subcommittee.

The meeting concluded at 4:30 p.m.









